

## REMARKS

This application was originally filed on 21 June 2001 with forty two claims, four of which were written in independent form. No claims have been allowed.

Claims 32, 33, and 35 were objected to for various reasons. Claims 32, 33, and 35 have been amended to overcome these rejections.

Claims 1, 10, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,512,374 to Wallace et al. ("Wallace").

Amended Claims 1, 10, and 18 recite "depositing an organic resin coating material on said micromechanical device in sufficient quantity to prevent movement of said micromechanical device." Wallace does not show, teach, or suggest this limitation. To the contrary, Wallace teaches a film having a thickness "in the range of approximately 5 angstroms to approximately 100 angstroms."

Claims 2-9, 11-17, and 19-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace. Claims 2-9, 11-17, and 19-28 depend from Claims 1, 10, and 18 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons argued above with respect to Claims 1, 10, and 18, Wallace does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of Claims 1, 10, and 18, much less the limitations of Claims 1, 10, and 18 in combination with the additional limitations of Claims 2-9, 11-17, and 19-28.

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,391,800 to Redd et al. ("Redd").

Claim 29 has been amended to recite, a "micromechanical device having moveable structures wider than such structures are high" and "depositing an organic resin coating material on said solvent layer in sufficient quantity to prevent movement of said moveable structures." Wallace in view of Redd does not show, teach, or suggest these limitations. Redd specifically teaches the coating of high aspect ratio devices (abstract). Neither Wallace nor Redd address the limitations of depositing "in sufficient quantity to prevent movement of said moveable structures."

Claims 30-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace in view of Redd. Claims 30-42 depend from Claim 29 and should be deemed allowable for that

reason and on their own merits. For the reasons argued above with respect to Claim 29 Wallace in view of Redd does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of Claims 30-42 much less the limitations of Claim 29 in combination with the additional limitations of Claim 29.

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill  
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999  
Dallas, TX 75265  
(972) 917-4379  
FAX: (972) 917-4418